MONTANA LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Chapter 109 19 89

Bill H _____ S 236 Original bill & history ___C

H. Committee on Fish & Game			S. Committee on Fish & Game		
Hearing Date(s)	Mar 02	✓C	Hearing Date(s)	Feb 03	✓C
	_____	___C		Feb 14	✓C
	_____	___C		_____	___C
	_____	___C		_____	___C
Date Out	Mar 02	✓C		Feb 15	✓ C

Did this bill originate in an interim committee? ___Yes ___No

Committee _____ Report _____

SB 235 INTRODUCED BY HAGER, ET AL.
ALLOW CONTRACTORS TO MAKE PAYMENTS TO A BONA FIDE FRINGE BENEFIT FUND

1/25	INTRODUCED		
1/25	REFERRED TO LABOR & EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS		
1/26	FISCAL NOTE REQUESTED		
1/31	FISCAL NOTE RECEIVED		
2/02	FISCAL NOTE PRINTED		
2/09	HEARING		
2/15	COMMITTEE REPORT--BILL PASSED AS AMENDED		
2/17	2ND READING PASSED	33	16
2/20	3RD READING PASSED	29	21
	TRANSMITTED TO HOUSE		
2/21	REFERRED TO LABOR & EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS		
3/21	HEARING		
3/22	TABLED IN COMMITTEE		
4/06	MOTION FAILED TO TAKE FROM COMMITTEE	54	43
	DIED IN COMMITTEE		

SB 236 INTRODUCED BY SEVERSON, ET AL.
PROVIDE FOR COMPULSORY ELK KILL REPORTING

1/25	INTRODUCED		
1/25	REFERRED TO FISH & GAME		
1/26	FISCAL NOTE REQUESTED		
2/01	FISCAL NOTE RECEIVED		
2/02	HEARING		
2/03	FISCAL NOTE PRINTED		
2/15	COMMITTEE REPORT--BILL PASSED AS AMENDED		
2/17	2ND READING PASSED	42	0
2/20	3RD READING PASSED	50	0
	TRANSMITTED TO HOUSE		
2/21	REFERRED TO FISH & GAME		
3/02	HEARING		
3/03	COMMITTEE REPORT--BILL CONCURRED		
3/04	2ND READING CONCURRED	76	9
3/06	3RD READING CONCURRED	85	10
	RETURNED TO SENATE		
3/10	SIGNED BY PRESIDENT		
3/11	SIGNED BY SPEAKER		
3/11	TRANSMITTED TO GOVERNOR		
3/15	SIGNED BY GOVERNOR		
	CHAPTER NUMBER 109 EFFECTIVE DATE: 3/15/89		

SB 237 INTRODUCED BY SEVERSON, ET AL.
LIMIT COW ELK PERMIT TO TAKING OF COW ELK

1/25	INTRODUCED		
1/25	REFERRED TO FISH & GAME		
1/26	FISCAL NOTE REQUESTED		
2/01	FISCAL NOTE RECEIVED		
2/03	FISCAL NOTE PRINTED		
2/07	HEARING		
2/09	COMMITTEE REPORT--BILL PASSED AS AMENDED		
2/11	2ND READING PASSED	46	0

Scott Snelson stated that the Montana Wildlife Federation is opposed to SB 240.

Questions From Committee Members: Sen. Yellowtail asked Sen. Jenkins if it is possible for a disabled person to find a hunter who would be willing to pay for a "B" license and use it under his own name, to go out and get the deer and give him the meat.

Answer: Sen. Jenkins said yes, assuming that they will pay for the license, but the license will be made out to the hunter. But you would only have one license per rancher. This bill would allow multiple elderly people give you a certificate to shoot the deer on your ranch to reduce deer game damage.

Response: Sen. Severson spoke about an example that happened in the Bitterroot. A paraplegic shot a big horn sheep because his dad got him within shooting range.

Closing by Sponsor: Sen. Jenkins stated that he had planned to hear SB 240 as well as SB 306 at the same time. The Supreme Court in 1968 ruled that a hunter must get his own animal. I can't believe that is a constitutional rule because the Supreme Court has also ruled that hunting game is not a constitutional right, but a privilege. So, my point is that the legislature can write a law to change a supreme court ruling as long as it is not a constitutional rule.

Hunting is used to harvest animals. If you don't hunt them, they will die by disease and you will lose the whole heard. Through hunting you can prevent the disease. Another point is people who are living along poverty lines can use the meat throughout the year. I would like you to pass this bill, but I would like you to hold up on executive action so we can hear SB 306 at the same time.

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 236

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor: Sen. Severson stated he has thought along this line for a number of years. He has done some outfitting and took out one crew a year. Those people were from the Northeast. They thought it was remarkable that Montana did not have a compulsory checkout. It is a form of management tool for fish and game. The Department presently sends out surveys in the spring to get an estimate on what the kill was for the season. With the

compulsory check out they can have the exact number at the close of the season. There is a 10 day time limit for outfitters because they go on nine day trips. The local hunters also have a 10 day time limit but they often will report within one or two days.

List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:

Ron Marcoux, Department Fish, Wildlife & Parks
Scott Snelson, Montana Wildlife Federation

List of Testifying Opponents and What Group They Represent:

None

Testimony:

Mr. Marcoux left his testimony. See Exhibit #2.

Scott Snelson stated that the Federation is always concerned with getting accurate data on population and we want to go with the best system that is available. If this is the best system that is available, we support it fully.

Questions From Committee Members: Sen. Jenkins wasn't sure if the Fish, Wildlife & Parks Department supported the bill.

Answer: Mr. Marcoux stated that yes, they did support it, and mentioned that it depends on how good a return rate there will be, and we have to enforce that compliance. Our suggestion is to go on a pilot basis first, rather than instituting a full statewide program immediately.

Question: Sen. Yellowtail asked Mr. Marcoux how the pilot program would work.

Answer: Mr. Marcoux stated that they would take one hunting district, for instance the Bitterroot, and send them some new tags.

Question: Sen. Jacobson asked Sen. Severson what would happen if the hunter lost his card.

Answer: Mr. Marcoux responded by stating that the Department would issue them a duplicate when proper verification was provided. Then they have to sign an affidavit stating that they did lose it.

Questions: Sen. Severson asked Mr. Marcoux if a stub is needed to retain with the permit.

Answer: Mr. Marcoux thought it might be a good idea because sometimes there are problems in the mail, or the person doesn't have a acceptable proof. He stated that he would want to study the idea of a stub more.

Question: Sen. Jenkins suggested to Sen. Severson to delay the penalty for two years and try it out during those two years.

Answer: Sen. Severson asked him how you could gauge if the bill works well without the penalty. It is my opinion that without a penalty there won't be 100% return. With a penalty there will be 100% return.

Question: Sen. Rapp-Svrcek asked Mr. Marcoux how a pilot project would be done.

Answer: Mr. Marcoux stated he would have to look into that.

Question: Sen. Yellowtail asked Sen. Severson how could the recordkeepping be maintained?

Answer: Sen. Severson stated that all you would have to do is keep track of those who don't report. That shouldn't be too many people. It has to be 100% compliance.

Closing by Sponsor: Sen. Severson mentioned that there is a penalty in the bill. You are required to send in the card within 10 days of the kill or 10 days after the closing of the season. So, you will know almost exactly what the harvest was.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 1:54 p.m.

FISMIN.202

ELMER D. SEVERSON, Chairman

ROLL CALL

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

51st LEGISLATIVE SESSION -- 1989 Date 2/2/89

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Sen. Elmer Severson	X		
Sen. John Anderson Jr.	X		
Sen. Judy Jacobson	X		
Sen. Al Bishop	X		
Sen. Paul Rapp-Svrcek	X		
Sen. Loren Jenkins	X		
Sen. Bill Yellowtail	X		

Each day attach to minutes.

SB 236
February 2, 1989

Testimony presented by Ron Marcoux, Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks

The intent of SB 236 to obtain timely and total harvest results for elk populations, if successfully implemented with full compliance, would provide exact harvest rates on our elk species. Timely, complete harvest information would provide benefits for our elk management program.

In our efforts to evaluate this proposal for Montana, we contacted two western states who have experience with a "report card" or "license stub" similar to that proposed in this bill. Colorado had a mandatory report card that a sportsman was required to return 10 days after a kill or, if unsuccessful, 10 days after the end of the hunting season. Due to record keeping problems and only a 25% return rate, Colorado has dropped this procedure.

Washington also has a mandatory report card but only for successful hunters. There is no penalty for noncompliance and it is not enforced. Washington experiences an approximate return rate of 50%.

The Department primarily uses a telephone survey to gather its hunter harvest information. Names are selected in a manner to assure a statistically valid response from each license type and hunting district because a statistically valid response cannot be guaranteed, and is usually not achieved for all hunting districts through a mail survey. An advantage of a telephone survey is the ability to question sportsmen and assure accurate answers to questions.

For many sportsmen this call is the only "live" conversation with a department representative during the entire year, and we believe it is a valuable and positive contribution to better department/sportsman relations. Other states have found attempts to enforce the mandatory report rule very difficult and usually result in negative contacts with sportsmen, which is not experienced with our telephone survey. An example would be cards purported to be lost in the mail.

In 1981, the department converted its harvest survey from a mail questionnaire to a telephone survey to improve accuracy at a reduced cost. It also provides the department an important opportunity to request other information to assist in addressing management issues.

Given the experience of other states, it might be desirable for Montana to initiate a pilot project to gauge compliance rates and receptivity before embarking on a statewide program.

SENATE FISH AND GAME
EXHIBIT NO. 2
DATE February 2, 1989
BILL NO. SB 236

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 250

Discussion: It was requested by the Justice Department to include in the bill "By request of the Department of Justice". This was added. See Exhibit #7

Amendments and Votes: None.

Recommendation and Vote: Sen. Jenkins moved to pass the bill. It was passed on a voice vote. DO PASS.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

Discussion: None

Amendments and Votes: None

Recommendation and Vote: Sen. Jenkins moved to pass the resolution. It passed on a voice vote. DO PASS.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 16

Discussion: None

Amendments and Votes: None

Recommendation and Vote: Sen. Jenkins moved to pass the resolution. It passed on a voice vote. DO PASS.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 306

Discussion: None

Amendments and Votes: None

Recommendation and Vote: Sen. Jenkins moved to table this bill. It passed on a voice vote. TABLED.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 236

Discussion: None

Amendments and Votes: Sen. Rapp-Svrcek moved for a "Sunset provision" to be able to look at it again in two years. It passed on a voice vote.

Amendments and Votes: Sen. Jenkins moved to pass the amendments. The amendments passed on a voice vote. See Exhibit #6.

Recommendation and Vote: Sen. Rapp-Svrcek moved the bill as amended. It passed on a voice vote. DO PASS AS AMENDED.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 2:28 p.m.

ELMER D. SEVERSON, Chairman

LAB/FISMIN.214

FISMIN.214

ROLL CALL

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

51st LEGISLATIVE SESSION -- 1989 Date 2/14/89

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Sen. Elmer Severson	X		
Sen. John Anderson Jr.			X
Sen. Judy Jacobson			X
Sen. Al Bishop	X		
Sen. Paul Rapp-Svrcek	X		
Sen. Loren Jenkins	X		
Sen. Bill Yellowtail	X		

Each day attach to minutes.

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 15, 1989

MR. PRESIDENT:

We, your committee on Fish and Game, having had under consideration SB 236 (first reading copy -- white), respectfully report that SB 236 be amended and as so amended do pass:

1. Title, line 6.
Strike: "LICENSEES"
Insert: "A PERSON ISSUED A SPECIAL ELK PERMIT FOR AN AREA WITH NO GENERAL ELK HUNTING"

2. Title, line 9.
Strike: "LICENSE"
Insert: "SPECIAL ELK PERMIT"

3. Title, line 10.
Following: "DATE"
Insert: " AND A TERMINATION DATE"

4. Page 1, line 18.
Following: "hunts"
Insert: "in hunting districts where there is no general elk hunting"

5. Page 2, line 2.
Following: "every"
Insert: "special"

6. Page 2, line 3.
Strike: "license"
Insert: "permit for a hunting district where there is no general elk hunting"

7. Page 2, line 7.
Strike: "licensee"
Insert: "permittee"

8. Page 2, line 11.
Strike: "licensee"
Insert: "permittee"

9. Page 2, line 12.
Strike: "be issued a license"
Insert: "apply for a special elk permit"

SENATE FISH AND GAME
EXHIBIT NO. 6
DATE February 14, 1989
BILL NO. SB 236

continued

10. Page 2, line 18.
Following: "date"
Insert: "-- termination"

11. Page 2, line 19.
Following: "approval"
Insert: "and terminates January 1, 1991"

AND AS AMENDED DO PASS

Signed: _____
Elmer D. Severson, Chairman

Amendments to SB Bill No. 236
1st Reading Copy

Requested by Senate Fish and Game

Prepared by Andrea Merrill
February 13, 1989

1. Title, line 6.
Strike: "LICENSEES"
Insert: "A PERSON ISSUED A SPECIAL ELK PERMIT FOR AN AREA WITH NO GENERAL ELK HUNTING"

2. Title, line 9.
Strike: "LICENSE"
Insert: "SPECIAL ELK PERMIT"

3. Page 1, line 18.
Following: "hunts"
Insert: "in hunting districts where there is no general elk hunting"

4. Page 2, line 2.
Following: "every"
Insert: "special"

5. Page 2, line 3.
Strike: "license"
Insert: "permit for a hunting district where there is no general elk hunting"

6. Page 2, line 7.
Strike: "licensee"
Insert: "permittee"

7. Page 2, line 11.
Strike: "licensee"
Insert: "permittee"

8. Page 2, line 12.
Strike: "be issued a license"
Insert: "apply for a special elk permit"

special drawings for five years after their conviction. The Montana Wildlife Federation is strongly in favor of this bill.

Mr. Marcoux: (See Exhibit #1)

Ms. Cahoon: (See Exhibit #2)

Testifying Opponents and Who They Represent:

none

Opponent Testimony:

none

Questions From Committee Members:

REP. KELLER: Does this violation refer to fishing violations? SEN. BISHOP: Those violations are listed on page one of the bill for specifics. Including game birds and game fish.

REP. REAM: On page 4, lines 4 and 5, why was that language struck? SEN. BISHOP: That was just unnecessary language.

Closing by Sponsor: SEN. BISHOP: waived his closing to the Committee.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 39

Motion: Rep. Kasten motioned a "do pass"

Discussion: none

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes: none

Recommendation and Vote: THEREFORE, THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS A "TO BE CONCURRED IN" FOR THIS BILL WITH A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 236

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

SEN. SEVERSON: I call this my "compulsory check-out bill", it is much more "watered down" then when first introduced. Basically what the bill intended to do in it's original form was to require anyone elk hunting to report a kill within 10 days. I look at it as a game management tool. Harvest numbers are important, particularly for the outfitters. I believe that the post-paid mail in card is a good system for the Fish and Game to implement. I think the hunters will accept this tool.

Testifying Proponents and Who They Represent:

Mr. Ron Marcoux/ Dept. of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Helena

Mr. Robert VanDerVeer/ Helena

Proponent Testimony:

Mr. Marcoux: (See Exhibit #3)

Mr. VanDerVeer: I think that this is a good bill, and will save us some money.

Testifying Opponents and Who They Represent:

none

Opponent Testimony:

none

Questions From Committee Members:

REP. KASTEN: This bill is for the special elk permits in an area, about how many would that be? SEN. SEVERSON: I would have to defer to Mr. Marcoux from the Dept. MR. MARCOUX: About 2,000 maximum. REP. KASTEN: A card would be issued on every license. MR. MARCOUX: The fiscal note was presented, presuming that we would do this for the entire state. That is why those particular figures are reflected on the fiscal note. REP. REAM: This was amended in the Senate for the special permit areas, therefore the figures on our fiscal note would be incorrect. This doesn't reflect the corrections.

REP. RANEY: What would the cost would be now? SEN. SEVERSON: The program will be cost saving. You will have an exact count when the season is through. Therefore, the Dept. would not have to conduct surveys.

REP. ELLISON: Wouldn't mailing in the permit be a problem? SEN. SEVERSON: It could be a check out computer card, the computer would do the detail work. It would have to be worked out in the beginning stages within the Dept.

REP. KASTEN: What would happen if someone should lose the card, or not send it in? MR. MARCOUX: It would place us in the position that technically s/he would not be allowed in drawings for an entire year. SEN. SEVERSON: We discussed in the Senate committee regarding the kind of card that would be implemented. We looked at a duplicate card system. As a hunter, they would then have some proof for themselves.

REP. RANEY: Why did the Senate reduce this down to just the special areas? SEN. SEVERSON: I believe it was yielded to

the Depts. wishes. It appears they wanted to have a trial study.

REP. ELLISON: Are your telephone surveys scientifically run? MR. MARCOUX: We get a 90% confidence level in the telephone surveys, we base our estimates on that statistical sample.

REP. KELLER: Currently, do you also send out any type of questionnaires? MR. MARCOUX: On certain species we do send out questionnaires, and attempt to get 100% return. REP. KELLER: Did you send, out this year in regard to landowner permits? MR. MARCOUX: Yes, that is a special situation. I believe on the landowners we have a 70% return and that was voluntary.

Closing by Sponsor: SEN. SEVERSON: It is important to note that there are several things that is needed to know in order to manage a herd of elk. First, you need to know how many elk you have. And how many in winter and in summer. This is an important tool. I can almost see the elimination of the permit system if this is enacted. This would be postage free and easy to implement.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 236

Motion: Rep. Hanson motioned a "do pass"

Discussion: Rep. Kasten: Addressed the Committee regarding her concern about the problem of perhaps a hunter not getting the mail-in permit back to be eligible for the drawings. Rep. Ream: Suggested insert the word "or post-marked" after the word "returned", or "post-marked to the Dept.". Mr. Marcoux: This bill, I believe, would allow the Commission to establish rules. Generally speaking, a post-marked date would be sufficient. Rep. Raney: It was stated in testimony that the mail in was mandatory in Colorado and yet they had only a 25% return. Voluntary in Washington and they have a 50% return. That tells me, a voluntary return program would have a greater return. Mr. Marcoux: In the state of Washington, I believe the returns were from only the successful hunters. Rep. Raney: Would you expect a similar return from everyone, unsuccessful or not? Mr. Marcoux: We developed the idea of having a penalty with the goal to get a 100% return met. With the voluntary, I know we would get less. Rep. Ream: Out in the Breaks, there is a tremendous demand for the available permits. So your not being fair to others that don't respond. It seems like a relatively mild penalty. Rep. Hanson: I think you would get the opposite effect, eliminating quite a few people. Some other method without punishment may work better.

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes: none

Recommendation and Vote: THEREFORE, THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS A

"TO BE CONCURRED IN" FOR THIS BILL.

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 237

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

SEN. SEVERSON: This cow permit system was enacted for one purpose. To harvest a number of cows. If you are going to have a permit system, then you should be allowed to meet it's purpose. This bill was" watered down" in order to allow the Dept. to study it's effects within their system.

Testifying Proponents and Who They Represent:

Mr. Ron Marcoux/ Dept. Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Helena

Mr. Robert VanDerVeer/ Helena

Ms. Julie Hacker/ self, landowner, Bonner

Proponent Testimony:

Mr. Marcoux: (See Exhibits #4 and #5)

Mr. VanDerVeer: We have a problem of too many people with too many permits. This bill will take care of some of these landowners with those problems.

Ms. Hacker: (See Exhibit #6)

Testifying Opponents and Who They Represent:

none

Opponent Testimony:

none

Questions From Committee Members:

REP. RANEY: I don't quite understand what this bill will do. MR. MARCOUX: What this bill will do is provide both residents and non-residents the opportunity to apply for permits. REP. RANEY: Do you think that this will increase the number of elk taken by non-residents? MR. MARCOUX: No, I think what this will probably do is allow the non-residents the same opportunities as the residents. Generally, speaking non-residents do not gravitate to cow hunting. We would have to wait and see what the results would be.

REP. ELLIOTT: On page 3, line 15, sub 3. I realize that this is to do with the amendments to the section, but is some concern in my area. A landowner with more than 640 acres

DAILY ROLL CALL

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

51st Session - Legislative Council

Date 3/2/89

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Bob Ream, Chairman	✓		
Jim Elliott, Vice-Chair	✓		
Robert Blotkamp	✓		
Ben Cohen	✓		
Fritz Daily			
Gene DeMars	✓		
~~Bob Pavlovich~~ Bob Gervais.			
Bob Raney			
Bill Strizich	✓		
Roger DeBruycker	✓		
Orval Ellison	✓		
Ralph Eudaily			
Marian Hanson	✓		
Betty Lou Kasten			
Vernon Keller	✓		
John Phillips	✓		

CS-30

ROLL CALL VOTE

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

DATE 3/2/89 BILL NO. SB 236 NUMBER

SWIFT

NAME	AYE	NAY
Rep. Blotkamp	✓	
Rep. Cohen	✓	
Rep. Daily	Ø	
Rep. DeMars	✓	
Rep. DeBrucker	✓	
Rep. Ellison	✓	
REp. Eudaily	✓	
Rep. Elliott	✓	
Rep. Gervais	✓	
Rep. Hanson	✓	
Rep. Kasten	✓	
Rep. Keller	✓	
Rep. Phillips	✓	
Rep. Raney	✓	
Rep. Ream	✓	
Rep. Strizich	✓	
TALLY	15	

maureen Cleary
Secretary

Chairman

MOTION: Hanson "do pass"

I to be concurred

Form CS-31
Rev. 1985

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 2, 1989

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on Fish and Game report that SENATE BILL 236 (REFERENCE copy -- BLUE) be concurred in .

Signed: _____
Bob Ream, Chairman

[REP. SWIFT WILL CARRY THIS BILL ON THE HOUSE FLOOR]

3/2/89
#3
3/2/89
SB236

SB 236
March 2, 1989

Testimony presented by Ron Marcoux, Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks

The intent of SB 236 to obtain timely and total harvest results for elk populations, if successfully implemented with full compliance, would provide exact harvest rates on our elk species. Timely, complete harvest information would provide benefits for our elk management program.

In our efforts to evaluate this proposal for Montana, we contacted two western states who have experience with a "report card" or "license stub" similar to that proposed in this bill. Colorado had a mandatory report card that a sportsman was required to return 10 days after a kill or, if unsuccessful, 10 days after the end of the hunting season. Due to record keeping problems and only a 25% return rate, Colorado has dropped this procedure. Colorado had a penalty, but it was never enforced.

Washington also has a mandatory report card but only for successful hunters. There is no penalty for noncompliance and it is not enforced. Washington experiences an approximate return rate of 50%.

The Department primarily uses a telephone survey to gather its hunter harvest information. Names are selected in a manner to assure a statistically valid response from each license type and hunting district because a statistically valid response cannot be guaranteed, and is usually not achieved for all hunting districts through a mail survey. An advantage of a telephone survey is the ability to question sportsmen and assure accurate answers to questions.

For many sportsmen this call is the only "live" conversation with a department representative during the entire year, and we believe it is a valuable and positive contribution to better department/sportsman relations. Other states have found attempts to enforce the mandatory report rule very difficult and usually result in negative contacts with sportsmen, which is not experienced with our telephone survey. An example would be cards purported to be lost in the mail.

In 1981, the department converted its harvest survey from a mail questionnaire to a telephone survey to improve accuracy at a reduced cost. It also provides the department an important opportunity to request other information to assist in addressing management issues.

Given the experience of other states, we suggest taking the pilot approach in Montana to gauge compliance rates and receptivity before embarking on a statewide program.

VISITORS' REGISTER

Fish and Game COMMITTEE

BILL NO. Senate Bill 236 DATE March 2

SPONSOR _____

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Bob Vandelinde	Helena	X	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

CS-33